

73. The method of claim 72 wherein the compound comprises one phosphonate group.

74. The method of claim 72 wherein the compound comprises one bis-phosphonate group.

75. The method of claim 72 wherein the compound comprises an optionally substituted carbocyclic aryl group.

76. The method of claim 72 wherein the compound comprises an optionally substituted heteroaryl group.

C 77. The method of claim 72 wherein the compound comprises an optionally substituted phenyl group.

REMARKS

Applicants submit herewith a Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement.

Claims 1-10 and 12-63 have been cancelled without prejudice, and claims 64-77 have been added. No new matter has been added by virtue of the amendments. For instance, support for the new claims appears e.g. in the original claims of the application.

It is also believed the amendments may be properly entered at this time, i.e. after final rejection, pursuant to 37 CFR 1.116 because the amendments do not require a new search or raise any new issues, and they reduce issues for appeal.

Indeed, the new claims correspond to claims previously examined and considered by the Examiner. For instance, claims 64-71 correspond to correspond to previously considered claims

2 and 5-10. Claims 72-77 correspond to previously considered claim 12.

Entry of the new claims at this time is earnestly solicited.

Claims 1-10 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. The rejection was based on a formality matter of recitation of the term "preferably".

The claims presented herein do not recite the term "preferably". Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Claims 1-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 over Chem abs. 966 (CA:126:324966).

Claims 1-10 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 over Chem abs. 820 (CA:130:209820).

For the sake of brevity, the two rejections are addressed in combination. Each of the rejections is traversed.


The cited documents do not describe the diseases or disorders recited in independent claims 64 and 72.

Accordingly, the rejections should be withdrawn. See *In re Marshall*, 198 USPQ 344, 346 (CCPA 1978) ("[r]ejections under 35 U.S.C. §102 are proper only when the claimed subject matter is identically disclosed or described in the prior art.").

It is believed the application in condition for immediate allowance, which action is earnestly solicited.

J. Jiao et al.
U.S.S.N. 09/406,269
Page 6

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'P. Corless', written over the printed name.

Peter F. Corless (Reg. 33,860)
EDWARDS & ANGELL, LLP
Dike, Bronstein, Roberts & Cushman IP Group
P.O. Box 9169
Boston, MA 02209
(617) 439-4444